



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/701,420

01/27/00

KUMASAKA

K

0694-127

EXAMINER

MM91/0627

HOPGOOD CALIMAFDE  
60 EAST 42ND STREET  
NEW YORK NY 10165

RUDD, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED:

06/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

701420

Applicant(s)

Kumasa ka et al

Examiner

M. Brdd

Group Art Unit

2834

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

## Period for Reply

3

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

1-11

- ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

## Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the:

- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 3(1-27-00)
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

7

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-4, and 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Japan (033).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanayama, Yamamoto or Sato in view of Japan (033), Japan (327) or PRIOR ART (Applicants fig. 1).

Kanayama (fig. 23), Sato (figs. 2, 3 & 14) and Yamada (figs. 4 & 5) teach the piezo electric transformer with multiple pairs of second (output) electrodes. They do not teach the side leads for the drive section or mounting on a PCB with power supply circuitry. However, each of Japan (033), Japan (237) and the Prior Art (applicants fig. 1) teach that side leads are conventionally used especially for laminated structures. Japan (033) also teaches mounting a transformer on a PCB with associated input/output circuitry. Thus to use side leads for their conventional advantages and to provide integration of circuit elements for Sato, Kanayama or Yamamoto would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 09/701,420

Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 10 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoi, Sakurai or Shimizu.

The references teach supporting a piezo electric transformer in an elastic manner. They do not teach the specific mounting location. However optimization of a known device (e.g. thru routine experimentation) has long been held to be within the skill expected of the routineer. Thus selection of specific mounting locations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Budd/nt

6/25/01

MARK O. BUDD  
~~PRIMARY EXAMINER~~  
ART UNIT 212